

Miracles can Happen: The Unification of Post Partisan Revolutionary South Carolina

**A Monograph
by
LCDR Larry H Henke
U. S. Navy**



**School of Advanced Military Studies
United States Army Command and General Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas**

AY 2009

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 02-07-2008		2. REPORT TYPE Monograph		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) Jul 2008 – May 2009	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Miracles Can Happen: The Unification of Post Partisan Revolutionary South Carolina				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) LCDR Larry H. Henke				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) School of Advanced Military Studies 250 Gibbon Avenue Ft. Leavenworth, KS 66027				8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Command and General Staff College 100 Stimson Ft. Leavenworth, KS 66027				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) CGSC, SAMS	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT <p>This monograph analyzes the events that led to South Carolinas' uncommon democratic unification following the bitter partisan fighting of the American Revolution. From the study, the author identified common threads in events, or ideals that fostered the birth of a united nation following guerilla warfare within. The focus did not center on a model for construction of a Constitutional Republic, but instead the focus was on gleaned the basis for popular unity following irregular conflict.</p> <p>In today's era of persistent conflict and uncertainty, the measure of victory has shifted from those used in past wars. The capitulation of a massed enemy army is no longer the measure of mission accomplishment. Now, the establishment of popular unity towards a common good is the goal for successful extended peace following conflict.</p> <p>From the unique experience the Americans faced following the American Revolution, this work draws links between how Britain chose to fight the American Revolutionary War, the violent partisan warfighting of the separate American factions, and their resultant motivations in the rebuilding. The study follows a broad range of secondary sources covering the American Revolution for insight into the arrogant nature of the British parliament leading to conflict, the brutal nature of the war, and the commonality of thought and action between the two Colonial factions post conflict.</p>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Stability Operations, Post Partisan Warfare, Rebuilding/Reunification					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT (U)	b. ABSTRACT (U)	c. THIS PAGE (U)			COL Stefan Banach
			(U)	47	19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code) 913-758-3300

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

SCHOOL OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES

MONOGRAPH APPROVAL

LCDR Larry H. Henke

Title of Monograph: Miracles can Happen: The Unification of Post Partisan
Revolutionary South Carolina

Approved by:

Dan C. Fullerton, Ph.D.

Monograph Director

Michael Lee, Col, USMC

Second Reader

Stefan Banach, COL, IN

Director,
School of Advanced
Military Studies

Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.

Director,
Graduate Degree
Programs

Abstract

MIRACLES CAN HAPPEN: THE UNIFICATION OF POST PARTISAN REVOLUTIONARY SOUTH CAROLINA by LCDR Larry H. Henke, U. S. Navy, 47 pages.

This monograph analyzes the events that led to South Carolinas' uncommon democratic unification following the bitter partisan fighting of the American Revolution. From the study, the author identified common threads in events, or ideals that fostered the birth of a united nation following guerilla warfare within. The focus did not center on a model for construction of a Constitutional Republic, but instead the focus was on gleaned the basis for popular unity following irregular conflict.

In today's era of persistent conflict and uncertainty, the measure of victory has shifted from those used in past wars. The capitulation of a massed enemy army is no longer the measure of mission accomplishment. Now, the establishment of popular unity towards a common good is the goal for successful extended peace following conflict.

From the unique experience the Americans faced following the American Revolution, this work draws links between how Britain chose to fight the American Revolutionary War, the violent partisan warfighting of the separate American factions, and their resultant motivations in the rebuilding. The study follows a broad range of secondary sources covering the American Revolution for insight into the arrogant nature of the British parliament leading to conflict, the brutal nature of the war, and the commonality of thought and action between the two Colonial factions post conflict.

To narrow the scope, attention focuses on the irregular style of fighting in South Carolina and the unification following as a representation of the rationale of the American Colonists. In search of catalysts for post conflict unification, the author studied the background for the foundation of the American colony, Britain's violent theme for the Southern Campaign, specifically the brutality of Colonel Banastre Tarleton, and how this influenced the resolve of American General Nathanael Greene and his southern Patriot forces. In the end, the study of the rebuilding effort of South Carolina provides a roadmap from conflict to peace following irregular warfighting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Monograph Approval Page.....	i
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Introduction	1
Background	6
Revolutionary War Comes to South Carolina	17
Analysis of the Rebuilding of South Carolina.....	32
Conclusions	40
Bibliography	44

Introduction

On 14 January 1784, the Congress of the Confederation ratified the treaty of Paris ending the American Revolutionary War and 170 years of British control in the Americas. In the American Revolution, Patriot insurgents overthrew British rule and subdued their staunchly supportive Loyalist colonial cohorts. The Patriots sought civil and economic freedoms they realized could only be granted via self-rule free from British tyranny. To meet their desired ends, the Patriots vowed to fight anyone who stood in their way. In 1780, British Redcoats decimated the Continental Army in the South following the siege of Charleston and the subsequent battle at Camden. Afterward, civilian guerilla fighters picked up the torch and sustained the cause. From here grew a bitter partisan war pitting neighbor against neighbor as the British Redcoats, with the aid of American Loyalists, maneuvered to remain in control. However, the British forces could not extinguish the Patriot resolve. Miraculously, in the end, the insurgent Patriots were triumphant, ending British rule in the American colonies.

The Brutal struggle of the American Revolution culminated in the unique reunification of the American colonies following the ratification of the Constitution. Historically, the violent overthrow of an autocratic rule creates a governmental void, with the victorious insurgent army filling the void and imposing their brand of autocracy over the state.¹ Examples include the French Revolution, Russian Revolution, Chinese Revolution, and more recently the Cuban and Somali Revolutions. The cycle has rarely led to the successful formation of a democracy; however, the United States of America is arguably the sole exception. How is it then that following the violent irregular warfighting of the American Revolution the factions, both Patriot and Loyalist, were able to put aside their differences, unite for the popular common good, and ratify the document of democratic enlightenment, the Constitution of the United States?

¹ Larry Diamond, "Promoting Democracy in Post-Conflict and Failed States," *Taiwan Journal of Democracy* Volume 2, No. 2 (2005): 96.

This monograph will search for the driving factors that allowed the separate factions to downplay their differences and unite for a common good. It will identify the common threads that fostered the birth of a united nation following irregular warfare within. Highlighting a series of British missteps, the author will draw links between the way Britain conducted war that led to their defeat and fostered the unification of the American Colonists following the end of conflict.

Leading up to the Declaration of Independence colonial Patriots continued to voice their desire for their just inclusion in the British Parliament. Following the Seven Years War², Britain was heavily in debt and Parliament turned to its colonies for additional revenue through increased taxation. With no consideration for the Americans' dissent to taxation, the British government continued to impose its will to the perceived detriment of the fledgling colonies. The Stamp Act enacted in March 1765 required the payment of a small duty to England for the purchase of stamps to affix to legal documents and other official papers. In reaction, the people of Boston, revolted and burned down the house of the stamp distributor. Other colonies followed suit with similar acts of retribution. By October 1765, nine colonies had issued a petition to Parliament denying their capacity to tax any of the colonies.³ Seen as punishment, the Townsend Acts of 1767 brought new taxes to the colonies and similar retribution from the colonists. The Tea Act in 1773 continued the downward spiral of reprisal between England and the colonies culminating in the Coercive Acts of 1774 that would lead to the American Revolutionary War.

Any chance of continued British rule over the American Colonies quickly wore away as conflict between to two sides grew. The brutal method by which the Redcoats and their hired German mercenaries waged war eroded their credibility with both the "Rebels" and those remaining loyal to the Crown. Taking a page from the U.S. Army's field manual on

² The portion of the Seven Years War fought on the North American continent is also known as the French-Indian War 1754-1763. In this portion, the American Continental Army allied with the British to defeat the French.

³ U.S. State Department, "Parliamentary taxation of colonies, international trade, and American Revolution, 1763-1775," *USA.gov*, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/cp/90617.htm> (accessed January 18, 2009).

counterinsurgency, a potentially more productive strategy for the British Army should have been in promoting a secure environment from which the Loyalists could thrive. A complementary strategy of portraying Patriots as lawless rebels, bent on undermining the established peace, could have isolated them from popular support. Contrarily, the British neglected the security of the Loyalists and instead committed their own savage lawless acts in pursuit of the Patriots. These brutal actions strengthened the resolve of the Rebels, convinced fence sitters to fight British oppression, and drew increasing violent revenge against the Loyalists. Support from the Loyalists waivered as increased demands for protection and stability were not realized. In the end, Rebels and Loyalists could point to Britain as the cause of their fratricidal conflict. The driving forces behind colonial American unification were the British government's underlying arrogance, its' disregard for American's ambitious desire for self-rule, and the vicious manner in which its' army waged war.

From these insights into the historic experiences of the partisan fighters in the American Revolution, a framework for present day and future rebuilding nations will be collected. The focus will not center on the construction of a Constitutional Republic model for use as a template for others. Instead, the core will be on researching catalysts for popular unity in the aftermath of irregular conflict. To narrow the scope, attention will center on the brutal fighting in South Carolina during Britain's Southern Campaign. In South Carolina, war atrocities by both factions collapsed all governmental processes and dismantled society to the point of a savage state.⁴ The extreme case of partisan fighting in South Carolina during the War and the miraculous unification following will serve as an accurate representation of the rationale that drove the American Colonists. The author will study Britain's history in the American colonies, highlighting British missteps and the violent theme for the Southern Campaign. The monograph will show how the

⁴ Robert M. Weir, "The Violent Spirit, the Reestablishment of Order, and the Continuity of Leadership in Post-Revolutionary South Carolina," in *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 71.

callous and vindictive warfighting nature of Britain and its colonial allies bolstered Patriot motivations, turned fence sitters toward the Rebel cause, and alienated all but the staunchest Loyalists.

The author will study post conflict rebuilding efforts for evidence of commonality of thought and action between the two Colonial factions. As stated, the expected outcome of the overthrow of the autocratic British rule would be for the Continental Army to fill the void with their version of autocracy led by George Washington. The Americans avoided this trap when Washington turned down the position of despot over the colonies.⁵ Patriot leaders conceded portions of their garnered political power, and shared their limited rebuilding funds for the popular common good and the promotion of peace. All but the most fervent of Loyalists accepted the post-fighting provisions, put aside their differences, and accepted the relative peace and security reunification offered.

Following the surrender of General Cornwallis on 19 October 1781 at Yorktown, even in defeat, the British Crown wanted to continue the struggle.⁶ The need for forward basing from which the lucrative Caribbean territories could be defended, and the economic support the raw material trade with the Americas provided still remained for England. However, mounting national debt, economic hardship for English merchants, coupled with the failed exploits of the British Army turned the tide of support for the King to the point further attempts to reestablish dominance over the Americans was no longer an option. Even with the Canadian provinces and

⁵ Evidence points to the fact George Washington was vehemently opposed to the notion of a single person holding as much power as a King in the American government following the Revolution. When questioned about the possibility, Washington writes in response, as quoted from Higginbotham in *War and Society in Revolution*, "It was 'with a mixture of great surprise and astonishment' that Washington responded to Nicola, whose screed left the commander in chief with 'painful sensations' that were truly unmatched 'in the course of the War'." He was "much at a loss to conceive what part of my conduct could have given encouragement to an address which... seems big with mischiefs that can befall my Country... you could not have found a person to whom your schemes are more disagreeable." Even, towards the end of the war, when many in his beloved Army worried if they would be compensated for their service or forgotten, Washington vowed he would remain respectful of the Congress and work for his men's payment in a "constitutional way". Don Higginbotham, *War and Society in Revolutionary America: The Wider Dimensions of the Conflict* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 198-200.

⁶ "The British Surrender at Yorktown, 1781," *Eyewitness to History* (2002), <http://www.eyewitnesstohistory.com> (accessed January 1, 2009).

Caribbean Island territories intact from which to mount another invasion attempt, all hope of maintaining the American Colonies under the Crown was lost. The way Britain waged war, if it did nothing else, showed the Colonial Loyalists that the Redcoats would never be the guarantors of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, which the Loyalists had previously thought.⁷ Can the historical study of Britain's missteps in the Americas acted out over 200 years ago find relevance today?

Irregular or guerrilla warfare is historically among the most common forms of warfighting.⁸ Therefore, the establishment of peace following irregular warfighting should be an emphasized area of study for the professional soldier. The establishment of popular unity towards a common good is a bedrock component of extended peace following revolution. The successful founding of the United States following the violent guerilla warfighting of the American Revolution stands as a unique example for study of how longstanding peace via popular unity is accomplished. Though the American Revolution stands as a distinctive example of democratic stability following guerilla warfare in revolution, the U.S. military has not utilized the full potential that can be gleaned from its historic study. Much can be learned from the disappointments of the arrogant English parliament, which would not listen to the complaints of its American Colonists, and from the failures of the superior British Army against the guerilla tactics of the American Patriots.

Until recently, with the revision of the Department of the Army's field manual entitled, *Stability Operations and Support Operations*, FM 3-07, February 2003, the U.S. military has not taken advantage of this history. A search of the entire document turned up no mention of any of the key actors, events, or ideals that drove the stability of the new American nation following

⁷ John S. Pancake, *This Destructive War: The British Campaign in Carolina 1780-1783* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1985), 244.

⁸ U.S. Department of the Army, *Counterinsurgency* (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters Department of the Army, 2006), 1-2.

war.⁹ Similarly, of the twenty-one vignettes in the Department of the Army's field manual entitled, *Counterinsurgency*, FM 3-24, December 2006, not one covers the failures of the British Crown when dealing with the American insurgents.¹⁰ More uncommon than the successful use of guerilla tactics against a superior force is the unification of the two warring factions following the end of violent conflict. If the events or shared ideals, which forged the exceptional reunification following the violent irregular conflict of the American Revolution, can be collected, they may serve as a foundation for the U.S. Military's operational scheme in future clashes. To understand how it happened that the world's mightiest military could surrender in defeat at the hands of insurgent American Patriots, one has to understand who the American Colonists were.

Background

In 1663, King Charles granted the Province of Carolina¹¹ to eight of his loyalist supporters, the Lords Proprietors¹². Initially, the majority of the settlers of the Carolinas were of common background immigrating from English settled Barbados or other English provinces in the Caribbean.¹³ The population in the territory grew at a rapid pace due to the generous land

⁹ Conducted document search for: American Revolution, Patriot, Loyalist, British Redcoat, George Washington, Nathanael Greene, Cornwallis, Clinton, Yorktown, and Constitution. Constitution was found in six instances but all spoke of the American legal considerations of going to war, not the formation of a governing document following revolution. From US Department of the Army, *Stability Operations and Support Operations* (Washington, D.C.: Headquarters Department of the Army, 2003).

¹⁰ MAJ Todd J. Johnson, "Nathanael Greene's Implementation of Compound Warfare During the Southern Campaign of the American Revolution" (Monograph School of Advanced Military Studies, 2007): 1.

¹¹ The Province of Carolina included the modern day states of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

¹² The eight Lords Proprietors were: Lord Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of Shaftesbury (1621 – 1683); Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon whose daughter Anne married James II, the eventual parents of Queen Mary and Queen Anne (1609 – 1674); George Monck, Duke of Albemarle who played a key role in returning King Charles from exile (1608 – 1670); William, Earl of Craven (1608 – 1697); Lord John Berkeley (1607 – 1678); Sir William Berkeley, appointed twice the governor of Virginia (1606 – 1677); Sir John Colleton, the treasurer of the Royal Navy (1608 – 1666), and Sir George Carteret (1615 – 1680). Louis B. Wright, *South Carolina: A Bicentennial History*, (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1976), 38.

¹³ "South Carolina," South Carolina Military Museum, <http://www.scguard.com/museum/South%20Carolina.htm> (accessed January 2, 2009).

grants and religious freedoms the Lords Proprietors offered its settlers.¹⁴ By 1700, the colony contained a wide array of ethnic and religious backgrounds. French, Scots-Irish, German, Welsh, Jewish, Dutch, and Swiss pioneers had settled in the South Carolina territory and made up over half the white population.¹⁵ The new settlers came with diverse backgrounds. They also brought diseases which the Native Americans had not been exposed to and had no natural defenses.¹⁶ Devastated by disease and the loss of their lands to the white settlers, Native Americans ignited numerous Indian revolts in the territory. The vicious attacks culminated in the Yemassee Indian War (1715-1717). The war brought some of the most brutally savage assaults any of the thirteen colonies saw. The war delivered the South Carolina colony to the brink of annihilation.¹⁷ War-weary settlers, scared for their security, no longer trusted proprietary rule. The South Carolina settlers revolted and took charge of the colony. Saving its loyal supporters from a seemingly failed investment, the British crown bought out the interests of the Lords Proprietors and South Carolina became a Royal province in 1719.¹⁸

From the time of the first settlers, the American Colonies formed with little direct help from England.¹⁹ Left alone, in the face of adversity and from humble beginnings, the colonists successfully carved out a prosperous colony from the American wilderness. South Carolina's temperate climate and rich agricultural potential would quickly make it the jewel in the crown²⁰ of the American Colonies. For little cost, England, the mother country, received territorial expansion in the "new world" with high potential for prosperity. Things changed following the Seven Years War. The war's effect significantly shaped British and American attitudes for each other. The war involved all the European powers, but in North America, it pitted France and its

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ "A Brief History of South Carolina," *The Official Website of the State of South Carolina* (2009), <http://www.state.sc.us/scdah/history.htm> (accessed January 2, 2009).

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Don Higginbotham, *War and Society in Revolutionary America: The Wider Dimensions of the Conflict* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 47.

²⁰ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 15.

Indian allies against Britain and its American colonies in a struggle for territory. The Colonists eagerly augmented the English Army against its enemies on the continent. For the Americans, the allied victory generated a surge of British patriotism immediately following the war. A sense of liberating self-importance grew from the partnership on the battlefield.²¹

Britain did not reciprocate the feeling. Years of conflict between the European powers had significantly increased the country's war debt. As English war debt grew so too did feelings of resentment and jealousy by the "mother country" protector for the prosperous American "child nation" across the Atlantic. Instead of building on the potentially strengthened ties forged from the war, Britain allowed the feelings to erode. For Britain, the cost of the Seven Years War was high, almost doubling the national debt from £75,000,000 to £130,000,000.²² Though the fight in North America contributed a proportionately small amount to the national debt, as compared to the war in its entirety, Parliament increasingly tried to tap the American colonies for taxes to pay down English war debts.

This did not sit well with Colonists whose revenues were already heavily strained with war debt. In the 1760's and 1770's resentment towards the British Parliament gained strength. Benjamin Franklin argued before the House of Commons in 1766, "Colonies raised, clothed and paid during the last war, near 25,000 men [annually], and spent many millions." In addition, they had paid taxes, "far beyond their abilities, and beyond their [fair] proportion, [and] they went deeply into debt doing this."²³ British legislators ignored Franklin's argument. The practice of British economic nationalism over the Americans steadily increased. The taxation acts and accords passed by Parliament grew progressively arbitrary for the Colonists. The Colonists pleaded to collect their own taxes in support of raising their own army. For the Colonists, the

²¹ Richard D. Brown, *Major Problems in the Era of the American Revolution 1760-1791* (Lexington, MA: DC Heath and Company, 1992), 75.

²² Michael Stephenson, *Patriot Battles* (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2007), 6.

²³ John Freling, *Almost a Miracle: The American Victory in the War of Independence* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007), 23.

proposal would decrease their burden on England, but British legislators ignored this also.

Parliament wanted to continue the parasitic relationship with the Americans. The mother-child relationship grew tiring for the Colonists, replaced by thoughts of self-determination.

The Colonists rightly felt like they had no voice in determining their own destiny. They had no control over measures vital to their welfare. They had no formal power to declare war, shape peace treaties to their aims, or pass acts regarding trade or taxation contrary to English desires.²⁴ The cry for “no taxation without representation” spread through the colonies as the motto for Colonial displeasure. Though the cry rang through the colonies, it is too near sighted to boil down the growing Colonial displeasure over Britain’s increasingly oppressive rule to the rejection of taxation without representation. The Colonists were struggling with the supposed death of their liberties brought about by the tightening strangle hold of the British Parliament. The Americans saw themselves as free men who had the right to govern themselves. The British Parliament disparagingly answered the argument with the idea that the “virtual” representation of the Colonists in Parliament, like so many other of their English brothers, was sufficient. Even limited representative seats in the British run Parliament would not have appeased colonist ideology. The arguments waged by the Colonists before the war spoke the words of taxation and representation but they were about the inalienable rights of all men and the desire for free men to govern themselves.²⁵

The Age of Enlightenment had laid the foundation for these arguments. Though still in its infancy (it would be some time before they realized the full power of their argument) the enlightened Americans believed all men were created free and equal. These rights were absolute and granted by God at birth independent of status or wealth.²⁶ For the Patriots, the laws passed

²⁴ Oscar and Lilian Handlin, *A Restless People: Americans in Rebellion 1770-1787* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1982), 36.

²⁵ Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution 1763-1789* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1982), 26.

²⁶ Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, held the belief that nature endowed each man with an innate goodness. Each human has natural wants from which come natural

by the British Parliament were in opposition to these beliefs.²⁷ Parliament handed down laws with a sense of snobbery and superiority.

The mother country, England, sent out its own governors to act in the King's name and watch over the juvenile colonies.²⁸ Loyalists to England, those who saw benefit in the connection to the British Crown, offered the other side of the argument. They saw British rule as a necessary evil. For them, all the American Colonists prospered with the aid of Great Britain. They acquired great wealth through raw material trade across the Atlantic with English markets. American merchant ships freely navigated back and forth following sea-lanes protected by the Royal Navy.²⁹ The English Army (Redcoats) had long provided what they felt was necessary protection against enemy neighbors, namely the French, Spanish, and Native Americans. The clash between the enlightened ideals of the Patriots and the direction the British Parliament drove their relationship with the Americans continued to grow. Tensions between the Patriots and the British with Loyalist backing grew to a fever pitch and eventually led to violent skirmishes between the two sides. Obstinate, Parliament ordered British troops to discipline the insolent colonials and squelch the rising tensions. It did not have the desired effect.

In 1770 Boston, Royal troops fired on an angry mob, which had formed around them, resulting in the massacre of five Americans. Though American courts acquitted all but two of the

inalienable rights. Jefferson mentioned life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness but also believed in personal freedom from the freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, and the right to property. All men should be able to exercise their rights freely as long as they do not impinge on others. From Barbara MacKinnon, *American Philosophy* (New York, NY: State University of New York Press, 1985), 37-38.

²⁷ Thomas Paine echoed the sentiments of Jefferson in his articles, *Common Sense*, and, *Rights of Men*. Paine argued that the sovereignty of the state resided with the people. The people grant Government power only to guarantee the rights of the individual since the individual is limited in their ability to protect their rights alone. Paine believed only a Democratic Republic could be trusted to protect the rights of men. From Steven Kreis, "Thomas Paine, 1737-1809," *The History Guide: Lectures on Modern European Intellectual History* (2000), <http://www.historyguide.org/intellect/paine.html> (accessed February 14, 2009).

²⁸ Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution 1763-1789* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1982), 25.

²⁹ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 15.

British soldiers³⁰ of any charges, the question of what right the British had to exercise power in America spread throughout the colonies. Parliament continued to issue a series of punitive acts. Following the Tea Act, which offered tax advantages to the English East India Company and competitively locked out Colonial tea traders, the Bostonians again lashed out. The affair is now known as the Boston Tea Party of 1773. The cycle continued with a new round of punitive acts from parliament, dubbed “the intolerable acts” by the colonists. Parliament continually forced the hand of the Americans, culminating in a Declaration of Independence by 1776. At this time in history, when England could have benefited from an ally of rising strength against its neighboring European states, it had created another enemy. By arrogantly pushing the mother-child relationship upon the Americans, Parliament selfishly pushed away their kinsmen. England could have potentially fostered for gain American’s enlightened desire for the freedom to pursue self-determination if they would have instead pursued a brotherly relationship with the Americans. For Britain’s trouble, instead of an ally, they were on the verge of civil war with their own countrymen.

Turning to South Carolina, by 1770, its population had grown to an estimated 124,000.³¹ That made it the eighth largest of the thirteen original colonies. The population of the capital city, Charleston, rose to rank it as the fourth largest colonial city. Its population of approximately 8,000 fell behind only Boston, Philadelphia, and New York.³² The province’s booming population had already paid great dividends on the Royal investment made just fifty years prior. South Carolina’s real wealth to the British Crown came from its agricultural trade with the homeland. Prior to the Revolution, South Carolina was the lead exporter of rice and indigo (plant

³⁰ At the Boston Massacre, present were the British officer in charge, Captain Thomas Preston, seven privates and one corporal. All British soldiers involved in the massacre escaped punishment with Captain Preston and six of his men acquitted of all charges and the remaining two soldiers, found guilty of manslaughter, pleading “benefit of clergy” and released. Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution 1763-1789* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1982), 204-206.

³¹ U.S. Census Bureau, “Estimated Population of American Colonies, 1630-1780,” in *The World Almanac and Book of Facts 2008* (New York New York: World Almanac Education Group, 2008), 592.

³² *Digital History*, <http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/historyonline/us6.cfm> (accessed January 2, 2009).

that produces a highly prized rich blue dye) to England. Due to the high demand for South Carolina's agricultural resources and its growing slave population, which made large plantation farming possible, the wealth in South Carolina grew at an astounding rate. By 1774, the wealth per free person in the Southern Colonies was four times that of the New England Colonies and two and one-half times that of the Mid-Atlantic Colonies.³³ The wealth accumulated by the elite in South Carolina's "lowcountry" far and away led all other Colonies, even the relatively rich Southern Colonies of Maryland and Virginia. Nine of the ten wealthiest American Colonists, including Peter Manigault the richest American, resided in South Carolina.³⁴

South Carolina's great wealth, however, was not spread evenly throughout the colony. South Carolina is really a story of two separate regions known as the "lowcountry" and the "backcountry". The wealthy lowcountry encompasses the colony's coastal region and extends approximately fifty miles inland.³⁵ The exact geographical boundaries that define the lowcountry are unimportant other than they contain the fertile marshland that was ideally suited to the cultivation of rice fields. The early Carolinian settlers of English decent dominated this area. The trade of agricultural goods grown in the lowcountry to their brothers in England created strong ties to their English homeland. They used the great wealth accumulated from the trade of rice and indigo to build an opulent upper-class society filled with English books, clothing, furniture, pictures and life's other elegances.³⁶ In 1773 a New England visitor in awe stated, "In grandeur, splendour of buildings, decorations, equipage, numbers, commerce, shipping, and indeed in almost everything, it far surpasses all I ever saw, or ever expect to see in America."³⁷ The area housed the aristocratic elite; the mentioned elite consisted of the planters, slave-owners,

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 15.

³⁵ Walter B. Edgar, *Partisans and Redcoats* (New York, New York: HarperCollins, 2001), 1.

³⁶ Allan Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924), 42.

³⁷ Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 170.

and merchants. Ties with England remained so strong that parents believed a son's education was not complete until he had finished at an English University or the Inns of Court.³⁸ Men like Edward Rutledge³⁹ and Christopher Gadsden⁴⁰ were raised here.

In sharp contrast to the lowcountry, with its aristocratic elite of British ancestry, was the South Carolina backcountry. The backcountry by definition was simply the rest of the colony that was not lowcountry. It extended from the coastal shelf to the mountains in the west. Thick rugged land inhabited by Native Americans dominated the backcountry. Noble slave-owning elites did not flock to the backcountry. Instead, frontiersmen in search of the promise of free land and religious freedom settled the region. The practice of offering land rights to settlers in order to create a buffer from Indian attack around the lowcountry began with the Lords Proprietors and continued in the Royal Colony.⁴¹ South Carolina's land policy offering 100 acres for each male head of household and fifty acres for each member of his family was more enticing than its colonial neighbors of Virginia or North Carolina and attracted numerous settlers.⁴² The backcountry settlers brought with them diverse backgrounds. Unlike the lowcountry elite, they were an ethnic hodgepodge of vast European immigrants and previous settlers of other American Colonies in search of prosperity. The hands of rugged frontiersmen and their families working to the limit of human endurance, clearing heavily timbered land and planting crops shaped

³⁸ Allan Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924), 42.

³⁹ Edward Rutledge was born in Charleston 23 November 1749 to wealthy parents. His father, a physician, was a Scots-Irish immigrant. His mother of English decent was second generation Charlestonian. Rutledge studied law at Oxford, and returned to Charleston to practice. He was one of the original signers of the Declaration of Independence, though he wished to mend differences with England. His older brother John was the first governor of South Carolina. Edward was influential in guiding the rebuilding of South Carolina in the aftermath of war, and later served as the state's governor.

⁴⁰ Christopher Gadsden was born in Charleston in 16 February 1724. His father, Thomas Gadsden, served in the British Royal Navy and worked as the customs collector for the port of Charleston. At an early age Christopher was sent to Bristol, England for his education. He returned to Charleston in 1741 with a large inheritance from his parents. His wealth and influence continued to grow as a well-respected merchant in South Carolina. He would become an influential Patriot leader during the rebuilding of South Carolina.

⁴¹ Louis B. Wright, *South Carolina: A Bicentennial History* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1976), 84.

⁴² Walter B. Edgar, *Partisans and Redcoats* (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2001), 3.

backcountry South Carolina.⁴³ The soft hands of lowcountry elite did not venture into the region. Men like Francis Marion⁴⁴ and William Cunningham⁴⁵ were raised here.

Several decades of immigration into the backcountry had dramatically eroded the sharp contrast in population and wealth between the lowcountry and backcountry. Just prior to the start of the Revolution, the backcountry region contained about three-fourths of South Carolina's white population.⁴⁶ With time, backcountry immigrant farmers, mill owners, and merchants were able to increase their wealth. With increased wealth came the increased need for security. The footprint of the settlers also significantly increased and continually encroached on Indian lands.

In the early 1760's, Cherokee Indians had had enough and ignited brutal revolts that spread across the backcountry. Many times the Indians forced fearful backcountry settlers to leave their frontier homes and possessions for the safety of fortified settlements located sporadically across the region. Those who did not retreat for the safety of the forts had their pick of anything left behind.⁴⁷ After the Indian attacks subsided, lawlessness across the region continued to take its toll. Influential members of the backcountry voiced their concerns to the

⁴³ Robert D. Bass, *Swamp Fox: The Life and Campaigns of General Francis Marion* (Columbia, SC: Sandlapper Press, Inc., 1972), 5.

⁴⁴ Francis Marion was born to first generation Carolina farmers on 26 February 1732. A small child of frail health, at the age of fifteen he decided to become a sailor and volunteered as a crewman for a schooner bound for the West Indies. On his one and only voyage the ship floundered, several crewmen died, and Marion was lost at sea for days. He survived and returned to his parent's farm with renewed health and vitality. He entered military service before his twenty-fifth birthday. Marion went on to earn the moniker, the "Swamp Fox" from his British adversaries as one of the most feared Patriot fighters in the Revolution.

⁴⁵ William Cunningham was raised in the backcountry of S.C. A Whig supporter, in 1775, he enlisted in the state's militia as a private in a ranger regiment. He later deserted the regiment before being punished by whip over a dispute with an officer. Accounts of what happened next differ, but most say Whig officers interrogating his family as to his whereabouts whipped his brother to death, and beat his father. William pursued his family's oppressor and shot him. He then raised an independent command of mounted Loyalists and took revenge on Patriots throughout South Carolina. His brutal exploits earned him the nickname of "Bloody Bill".

⁴⁶ Rachel N. Klein, "Frontier Planters and the American Revolution: The South Carolina Backcountry, 1775-1782." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 38.

⁴⁷ Walter B. Edgar, *Partisans and Redcoats* (New York, New York: HarperCollins, 2001), 13.

lowcountry government. They requested their share of tax appropriation for peace officers, jails, courts⁴⁸, and sought governmental representation proportionate to their population.⁴⁹

In addition, backcountrymen were uneasy with the lowcountry legislators' continuation of tax support for the Anglican Church though Episcopalians were in the minority in the region.⁵⁰ They were unable to crack the established oligarchy. The slave holding plantation owners of the lowcountry had feared that any reapportionment of the legislature would slowly erode their established plantocracy.⁵¹ By the late 1760's, backcountry pleas had only gained three seats in the lower house assembly though they contained a majority of the white population.⁵² The backcountry men, feeling their requests were continually ignored, took matters into their own hands.

From these beginnings, the South Carolina "Regulator" movement was born. Armed frontiersmen banded together and hunted down the gangs of bandits who terrorized their families. They captured numerous outlaw gang members of which only the lucky made it to Charleston for trial. They chased down, flogged, branded as criminals, or hanged the unlucky others on the spot. Though the outlaws did not give up easily, the Regulator movement was successful. The Regulators made steady work of the outlaws who either fled to other colonies, disbanded, or lost their lives. But the Regulators did not stop here.

Though born from necessity, the motivation for the Regulator movement turned political. They were now the self-proclaimed law of the backcountry and they wanted to continue their vigilante brand of "justice" in order to get ahead of the outlaw problem. The hard working frontiersmen turned their idle hands to the discipline of "Rogues, and other Idle, worthless,

⁴⁸ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 99.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁵¹ Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 268.

⁵² Rachel N. Klein, "Frontier Planters and the American Revolution: The South Carolina Backcountry, 1775-1782." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 38.

vagrant, people” in the region.⁵³ The Regulators heavy-handedly administered their “Plan of Regulation” to brutally control anyone they deemed had fallen from favor. Now, by the late 1760’s, victims of the Regulator brand of justice and respectable backcountry landowners had had enough.

Calling themselves the Moderators, a new group of men organized to control Regulator injustice. The cycle of violence continued until the lowcountry took notice. The Regulators were able to get six representatives elected to the assembly in 1768 by marching in mass to lowcountry places of election, but they were still underrepresented and disgruntled.⁵⁴ In 1769, the assembly was able to get the Regulators to disperse with the passing of the South Carolina Circuit Court Act.⁵⁵ In the Act, the lowcountry legislature divided the backcountry into four judicial districts.⁵⁶ This brought organized courts into the backcountry for the first time. This first step did not completely appease relations between the lowcountry and backcountry, but the plantocracy learned a valuable lesson. To promote solidarity in the colony on the verge of war with England, the Provincial Congress, in 1775, reapportioned the assembly and allowed the backcountry 76 out of 202 available assembly seats.⁵⁷

The Provincial Congress also, in a significant step, disestablished the Anglican Church as the traditional church of the colony and dissolved its tax support. These good faith acts by the lowcountry elite won friends with the rising members of the backcountry. The Regulator Movement wreaked havoc in South Carolina, and these concessions worked to fuse the two

⁵³ Walter B. Edgar, *Partisans and Redcoats* (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2001), 17.

⁵⁴ Rachel N. Klein, "Frontier Planters and the American Revolution: The South Carolina Backcountry, 1775-1782." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 43.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 43.

⁵⁶ Namely, the four judicial districts were Orangeburgh, Camden, Cheraws, and Ninety-six. Allan Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924), 11.

⁵⁷ Rachel N. Klein, "Frontier Planters and the American Revolution: The South Carolina Backcountry, 1775-1782." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 49.

regions. Although, they did not fix the rift deepened by decades of animosity between the two factions, they were steps in the right direction. Before they had time to mend the differences in South Carolina, it would be time to choose sides, Patriot/Whig or Loyalist/Tory, with the beginning of the Revolutionary War.

Revolutionary War Comes to South Carolina

In 1776 South Carolina, with the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the colony's Patriots and Loyalists drew sides for many different reasons. For years, the colony had been on the cusp of civil war because of constant turmoil between lowcountry leaders and backcountry frontiersman. With this background, one would think the lines that divided Patriot from Loyalist would be predictable and easily identified, but this is not the case. It is true, the Patriot cause in South Carolina grew from the lowcountry elite and for many in the backcountry, who distrusted anything the lowcountry did, this was cause enough to take the opposite side with the British. South Carolinians, however, also divided along a vast spectrum of political, religious, ethnic, and geographic lines.⁵⁸ Some families even divided with brothers or fathers and sons taking opposite sides. South Carolina became a patchwork of hostile districts. Citizens were set to fight their opposing faction, or in reprisal of past grievances, ravage and plunder their neighbors, whoever they may have been.⁵⁹

Surprisingly, the Regulators, who demonstrated their dislike for the lowcountry assembly, did not side with the Loyalists. Only six of the 120 known Regulators supported the Loyalists while fifty-five joined the Patriots.⁶⁰ The most outspoken Regulators managed to overcome their animosity for the lowcountry and join the Whig cause. Though they took up their

⁵⁸ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 99.

⁵⁹ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 100.

⁶⁰ Rachel N. Klein, "Frontier Planters and the American Revolution: The South Carolina Backcountry, 1775-1782." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 40.

fight for the protection of their own property during the Regulator movement, their growing wealth through commercial agriculture, and increased involvement in slave ownership tied them ideologically more and more to the wealthy lowcountry planters.⁶¹

The division between Patriot and Loyalist did not cleanly follow economic lines. Many wealthy planters had enough of the meddling by the British Parliament in their business affairs. They found British taxation laws arbitrary and amounted to economic tyranny. Others, however, appreciated the trade opportunity Britain provided for their raw materials. For them, London was the economic hub of a vast empire that afforded the way to economic prosperity.

Ethnic divisions are also difficult to predict. Though Britain was a longtime enemy of other European countries, especially those on the British Isles, they did not necessarily side against the British. In a study of 320 Loyalist claimants from South Carolina, foreign-born immigrants were more likely to side with the loyalists than native-born Americans had been.⁶² Backcountry frontiersman who did remain loyal to the Crown did so because of the continuing need for protection from Indian attack they thought British Redcoats would provide.⁶³ For many throughout South Carolina, it cannot be overstated how influential the sense of security provided by the Royal Navy escorting merchant ships and the Royal Army defending against Indian attack had been. They also hoped the British governmental authority in the region would weigh in and offset the political and social oppression the lowcountry elite held over the backcountry via their dominance in the colonial assembly.⁶⁴ It is difficult to predict with which side individual Americans would align. Numerous issues pulling each individual made the decision extremely difficult. Once they made the decision between Patriot and Loyalist, though, the division grew deep and profound.

⁶¹ Ibid., 40.

⁶² Ibid., 41.

⁶³ Russell F. Weigley, *The Partisan War: The South Carolina Campaign of 1780-1782* (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 11.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 11.

At the eve of the Revolution, South Carolina had a workable militia, a vast tradition of service provided by the past's numerous Indian conflicts, and a large stockpile of weapons and ammunition.⁶⁵ For the Patriots, decades of Whig control over the South Carolina assembly and their ability to appoint Whig sympathizers into leadership positions in the militia paid off at the outset of the Revolution. Militia leaders were able to control the vast majority of militia weapons and ammunition. The Patriots capitalized on this advantage and with it controlled the coastal region and much of the interior of South Carolina.⁶⁶ They disarmed and locked down all known Loyalists. Loyalists were not able to buy, sell, or bestow property. Patriots barred them from legal recourse and even the ability to recover debt. They were compelled to join the Patriot militia or handed heavy fines or severe punishment.⁶⁷ The preferred punishment of the day got a Loyalist tarred and feathered or given a "grand Tory ride".⁶⁸ Either left a devoted Loyalist humiliated, disfigured, or crippled. From the Loyalist perspective, British support was lacking and the future without intervention looked bleak.

Shots fired by the British on Patriot resistance at Lexington and Concord, Massachusetts on 19 April 1775 and again two months later at Bunker Hill in Charlestown, Massachusetts, just outside Boston, gave Loyalists across the colonies hope that the British would finally put down the rebel insurrection and restore order. Groups of Tories, which British forces hoped to organize into a Loyalist counter-revolution, banded together across the South. Back-to-back blows at the hands of the Patriots soon severely dampened growing Loyalist spirits.

The first devastating blow came in February 1776, at Moore's Creek Bridge near Wilmington, North Carolina. In North Carolina, a large Loyalist group of recent Scott-Irish

⁶⁵ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 13.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁶⁷ Russell F. Weigley, *The Partisan War: The South Carolina Campaign of 1780-1782* (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 58.

⁶⁸ A "grand Tory ride" is synonymous to "riding the rail", in which Loyalists were harshly paraded through town sitting atop a portion of split rail fence carried on others' shoulders. The perpetrators often bounced the ride recipients on the rail with their legs weighted down causing severe damage to the genitals and anus. Michael Stephenson, *Patriot Battles*, (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2007), 59.

immigrants banded together. As quickly as the Loyalist uprising formed, surrounding Patriot forces crushed it.⁶⁹ Meanwhile, a British Fleet from England carrying General Henry Clinton sailed for the South for a planned assault on Charleston, South Carolina to exploit Loyalist sentiment.⁷⁰ Then in June 1776, with his fleet delayed by weather, Charleston Patriots using the additional time fortified their positions and turned back Sir Clinton's invasion force. Clinton's underestimation of Patriot strength in Charleston turned into a humiliating failure. The British would not return to South Carolina for three years. Instead, the British turned their attention to the campaigns around New York and Philadelphia, as well as General Burgoyne's invasion south from Canada.⁷¹ The Redcoats, in effect, abandoned Loyalists in the South and left them to receive a passionate retribution from their Patriot neighbors.

In the North, American Commander in Chief, General George Washington, diligently fought the focused British effort. In the beginning, victories for his Continental Army did not come, but the Continentals' resolve was never defeated. Washington's best efforts barely kept his army one-step ahead of the British Redcoats. In six months of fighting, British troops pushed Washington out of New York and decimated ninety percent of his standing army, but they never gained the decisive battle that would crush the American rebellion.

Back in England, the belief was that the Royal Army and Navy would make quick work of the American rebellion. Britain's superior training and firepower would put the colonists back in their place, but a profound flaw in Britain's command and control structure made war with the Americans difficult.⁷² A vast ocean away from the fighting and weeks removed from communication with military leadership, Lord George Germain, the Secretary of State for the Americas, unsuccessfully tried to manage the combined war effort through centralized command

⁶⁹ John Morgan Dederer, *Making Bricks Without Straw: Nathanael Greene's Southern Campaign and Mao Tse-tung's Mobile War* (Manhattan, KS: Sunflower University Press, 1983), 26.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 26.

⁷¹ Ibid., 26.

⁷² John Freling, *Almost a Miracle: The American Victory in the War of Independence*. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007), 566.

and control. If the time and distance problem of trying to run a war in the eighteenth century from across the Atlantic were not enough, Germain's fellow cabinet members also hampered his efforts. Germain often found competing interests from other British cabinet members charged with the far reaching parts of the Empire and with homeland concerns, alike.⁷³ The command structure often had the Commander-in-Chief of British North American Army forces working in the opposite direction of the Commander Royal Navy's North American Fleet.

The difficulties with the command structure became so apparent that General Henry Clinton, subordinate to Britain's Army Commander-in-Chief, suggested directly to the Prime Minister, Lord Frederick North, that he appoint a supreme commander of all British forces in North America. From Clinton's suggestion, the commander would have decentralized authority from the Royal Cabinet, simplifying and coordinating strategic decision making in America. The creation of a Supreme Commander over British forces may have had disastrous consequences for General Washington and the Americans. Ian R. Christie in *Crisis of Empire* writes,

A coordinated push could hardly have failed to win the Hudson heights and draw a military cordon round New England. But the need for close coordination was not realized by any of the British ministers or commanding generals. The resistance Burgoyne was likely to encounter was grossly underestimated: it was thought he could reach and hold Albany without assistance. Howe at New York therefore saw no reason to defer his own pet scheme for the occupation of Philadelphia, and made matters worse by abandoning plans for a direct thrust through New Jersey in favour of a seaborne expedition which kept his army inoperative at sea and then isolated in southern Pennsylvania for many critical weeks. In consequence, although during 1777 the British secured control of Philadelphia and parts of New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware, they suffered a crushing loss by the destruction of Burgoyne's army...⁷⁴

In the winter of 1776, Washington was able to capitalize on his opportunity, regroup, and led the Americans to victory at Trenton and Princeton, New Jersey. These victories stole Britain's offensive advantage, and bought the Americans more time. Then, at Saratoga, New York, occurred a decisive victory for the Americans on 17 October 1777. American General

⁷³ Ibid, 566.

⁷⁴ Ian R. Christie, *Crisis of Empire: Great Britain and the American colonies, 1754-1783* (New York, NY: Norton, 1966), 102.

Horatio Gates isolated and trapped the army of British General Burgoyne. That day, over five thousand British troops laid down their arms and surrendered to the Americans.⁷⁵ The news of the American victory made its way back to Europe and helped sway the French to sign a treaty of alliance in official support of the American cause.⁷⁶

The threat of French entry into the war forced Britain to consolidate positions in a more defensive posture to defend against French invasion. The Royal Navy, taking defensive positions up and down the American coast, was able to repel the French fleet, but the damage was done. Americans immediately recovered their capital city, Philadelphia, and the Rhode Island colony as British troops withdrew.⁷⁷ The victory at Saratoga had other devastating psychological effects as well. Even if Britain still desired it, the war would no longer be trivialized as an attempt of the mother-country to subdue her American Colonies.⁷⁸ It was now a war between great powers on opposite sides. Just short years earlier both combatants fought side by side as kinsmen, now the rift had quickly grown so large the Americans had formed an allegiance with Great Britain's mortal enemy, the French.

In England, patience grew thin when news of Saratoga made its way home. As a result, England decided a change of command was necessary and promoted General Sir Henry Clinton to Commander in Chief. War in the North slowed to a stalemate with Clinton unwilling to be lured from his defensive positions in New York while Washington, lacking heavy artillery or sealift, was left unable to penetrate the British defenses for any gain. The idea of a decisive victory for the Crown over the Americans was slipping away.⁷⁹ With both sides dug in deep, the

⁷⁵ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 56.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 57.

⁷⁷ Ian R. Christie, *Crisis of Empire: Great Britain and the American colonies, 1754-1783* (New York, NY: Norton, 1966), 104.

⁷⁸ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 57.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 61.

war in the North was increasingly costly in both men and treasure. The English strategy needed to change. They set their sights on the southern colonies.

A “Southern Campaign” would secure more American territory for use as a bargaining chip to end hostilities, it would secure a forward southern port for the protection of the British Caribbean territories, and it would secure the rich Southern commodity trade needed to fuel the English economy.⁸⁰ The plan seemed more than feasible with Southern Royal Governors still supplying reports of a large loyal populous waiting to take up arms for the Crown; now was the time to act. Battle damaged with hurricane season approaching, the French sailed for their territories in the Caribbean, leaving open seas for the Royal Navy to execute their plan.

Britain’s new campaign strategy initially met with success. In December 1778, the combined Royal Navy and Army effort made quick work of the Southern Patriot resistance at Savannah, Georgia and soon they were on the move up the South Carolina coast. The British made a second attempt on Charleston, when Redcoats under the command of Major General Augustine Prevost attacked in the spring of 1779. Prevost’s force was not large enough to lay siege to the city, and Patriot defenses held off the attack.⁸¹ In the fall a French fleet, under the command of the Comte d’Estaing returned to Savannah with supplies and men. Re-supplied, the combined American and French forces staged a counter attack, but were unable to retake Savannah. D’Estaing in defeat, and himself badly injured, sailed with his fleet and men back to France.⁸²

Meanwhile, Clinton prepared for a third attempt on Charleston. He amassed a large fleet, numerous men, and ample stores. With good intelligence as to the defenses of Charleston from England’s previous two attempts, good reconnaissance from Prevost’s men in the area, and the French out of the way, Clinton mounted the third attempt to take Charleston. Cautiously, he surrounded Charleston in a coordinated land and maritime effort slowly squeezing in on General

⁸⁰ Ibid., 61.

⁸¹ Ibid., 66.

⁸² Ibid., 70.

Benjamin Lincoln and trapping his army on the Charleston peninsula forcing their surrender. In April 1780, Charleston finally fell into British hands, a devastating blow to the southern resistance. With Lincoln's 5000 man army forced to capitulate, ending with 4200 continentals and militia taken prisoner, Clinton's forces continued to successfully move through South Carolina.

The fall of Charleston was Britain's most decisive victory of the war.⁸³ News of the victory traveled quickly to England and was especially timely in silencing growing English protests over the course of the war.⁸⁴ The Americans raised a new southern Colonial army under Gates, but they took heavy casualties 16 August 1780 at the Battle of Camden. Following these decisive British victories, the remaining Patriot resistance was almost nonexistent as many Patriot leaders quickly accepted British parole to discontinue fighting. Next, British troops were able to defeat the last body of organized American troops in South Carolina at the battle of Fishing Creek 18 August 1780.⁸⁵ Now, all that remained to fight for the cause were hard fighting backcountry guerillas and their will to continue.

General Clinton, as Commander-in-Chief of the British Force, was anxious to return to New York and planned to leave the southern affair to General Cornwallis. Before his departure, he made a critical error. He proclaimed each South Carolinian had to swear an allegiance to the Crown and fight for the Royal flag beside their English brothers, or be considered rebels to the Crown and available for harsh reprisal.⁸⁶ The proclamation intended to be a show of strength to loyalist and a measure to discourage rebellious uprising, but it had undesired effects. With the "Jewel of the South" seemingly in hand, Clinton returned to New York victorious.

⁸³ John S. Pancake, *This Destructive War: The British Campaign in Carolina 1780-1783* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1985), 66.

⁸⁴ Ibid, 67.

⁸⁵ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 95.

⁸⁶ John Morgan Dederer, *Making Bricks Without Straw: Nathanael Greene's Southern Campaign and Mao Tse-Tung's Mobile War* (Manhattan, KS: Sunflower University Press, 1983), 29.

Surprisingly, following Clinton's departure, numerous South Carolinians retook the field for the Patriot Cause. The southern resistance might have disappeared if Clinton had given authority to accept neutrality.⁸⁷ Clinton's call for allegiance effectively removed the middle ground available for fence sitters or rebels who felt it violated their previously offered parole. The idea of pledging allegiance to the Crown and possibly being called upon to fight against fellow Americans did not sit well with many. For the second time in the war, the British unknowingly had the American resistance at the brink of annihilation but did not continue through to finish the task. Again, a sequence of miscalculated British missteps allowed the American cause to continue.

Across South Carolina, Loyalists were overjoyed when the Redcoats moved into the area, but the British overestimated the extent of the support they would provide.⁸⁸ They did not flock to take their place in the British ranks in enthusiastic support of Britain's strategy. Loyalists instead sought the means for retribution for years of suffering at the hands of Patriots. Tories preferred engaging in struggles of "fiendish animosity than flocking to British colors".⁸⁹ By the close of 1780, South Carolina was in the midst of a fratricidal civil war. In the book, *Making Bricks Without Straw: Nathanael Greene's Southern Campaign and Mao Tst-Tung's Mobile War*, Morgan Dederer writes, "War in the revolutionary South was brutal and vicious with strategy and tactics taking a backseat to revenge and hatred. Depredations carried out by both sides drove men from their homes to wage war of retribution, terror, and murder. Many guerillas were little more than bandits fighting under the aegis of either patriotism or loyalism".⁹⁰ South Carolinians learned a mobile strategy utilizing a hit-and-run style of fighting. The ruthless fighting patterns learned in the backcountry by the Regulators and the militia while fighting Indians were carried

⁸⁷ Allan Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924), 376.

⁸⁸ John Morgan Dederer, *Making Bricks Without Straw: Nathanael Greene's Southern Campaign and Mao Tst-Tung's Mobile War* (Manhattan, KS: Sunflower University Press, 1983), 28.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 36.

out across the state. They often implemented terror tactics that included torture, the killing of women, children, or the elderly, looting of farms, the plunder of plantations, and the destruction of churches.⁹¹

Even before the outset of the war, England overestimated the amount of Loyalist support they would receive upon arrival. When the turnout was less than expected they turned to other avenues for support. The flawed recruitment strategy of the Redcoats would have dire consequences to their aspirations for the colonies. Both sides, Patriot and English, attracted its share of objectionable individuals who would become damaging to their goals, but the British attracted particularly bad characters in their search for support. Men identified years earlier as outlaws by the Regulator movement sided with the English. The outlaws saw an opportunity to pillage and revenge past Regulator “justice” they had received.⁹² To the backcountrymen, Britain now appeared to sponsor the outlaw transgressions. For the Regulators, the majority of which joined the Patriots, the British sponsored outlaws strengthened the Patriot resolve and drove fence sitters to their cause.

The Indian issue had always remained a dividing factor for the citizens of South Carolina. One of the main motivators for the Loyalist was the need for British protection from the surrounding Indians. For the Cherokee tribes, the Revolutionary War brought opportunity. Though both Loyalists and Patriots tried to win the Cherokee as an ally, mainly to keep the additional fighters from the other side, the Cherokee sided with the English, to their detriment.⁹³ Britain, although they benefitted greatly from the increased trade in pelts available in the expanded American frontier, had long been sympathetic to the uncontrolled expansion of

⁹¹ John Freling, *Almost a Miracle: The American Victory in the War of Independence* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007), 16.

⁹² John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 103.

⁹³ Rachel N. Klein, "Frontier Planters and the American Revolution: The South Carolina Backcountry, 1775-1782." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, 37-69 (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 52.

Americans into Indian Territory. The Cherokee saw the possibility of alliance with the British as a means to curtail the expansion of the land-hungry Americans.⁹⁴ The perception of a British-Cherokee alliance did substantial harm to British goals. Frontiersmen flooded into the Patriot camps. It was evident they no longer could turn to the British as their protector from Indian attack on the frontier.⁹⁵

Worse than England's ability to recruit support to their ranks was their ability to keep the support they had. The English abandoned the Loyalists from the very beginnings of the war. The Loyalists would expose their passionate support for the crown after receiving British assurances of their safety. However, the British repeatedly abandoned their allies, and left them to the retribution of their bitter Patriot enemies.⁹⁶ Notably, Howe evacuated Boston in 1776, after assurances he would not, and the South Carolina Loyalists were abandoned for years after the failed attempt to invade Charleston. Cornwallis understood the problem. In a letter to Germain he wrote

For experience, my lord, has but too fatally taught us that if by desultory movements we tempt our friends to rise and join us and are afterwards obliged to leave them (no matter from what causes) we leave them to ruin and of course lose their future confidence, and with it our hopes of finishing this business.⁹⁷

Another ill-fated tactic based on a misunderstanding of Loyalist support was the strategy theorists identify as "economy of force".⁹⁸ In the South, once British troops won a province they would turn over security of the area to American Loyalist as soon as possible. The idea was to free up redcoats to move on to the next province extending their operational reach with less troops. This tactic misunderstood Loyalist motivation. Loyalists sought revenge for Patriot atrocities, and were not motivated to risk all in defense of the Crown. The British tactic put unprotected

⁹⁴ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 32.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁹⁶ Russell F. Weigley, *The Partisan War: The South Carolina Campaign of 1780-1782* (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 59.

⁹⁷ John Morgan Dederer, *Making Bricks Without Straw: Nathanael Greene's Southern Campaign and Mao Tse-Tung's Mobile War* (Manhattan, KS: Sunflower University Press, 1983), 52.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 27.

Loyalists repeatedly in the sights of rebel vengeance. The Loyalists quickly folded in retreat, which drew the ire of the redcoats. This clearly demonstrated too many fence sitters that it was better to side with the Patriots than die a loyalist death.⁹⁹

Besides the other factors, war atrocities went a long way towards undermining England's strategic objectives. It is true both sides committed horrible acts of war, but England was further burdened by their status as the Royal mother country and protector. English strategy should have placed emphasis on restoring "beams of Royal government". Not doing so was a catalyst for resistance.¹⁰⁰ Instead of promoting security and prosperity for the Loyalists, Redcoats, sanctioned by leadership, would often take counterproductive actions to their ends.

One of the most notorious incidents of British atrocities happened in the spring of 1780 at the hands of British Colonel Banastre Tarleton. After the fall of Charleston, Tarleton notoriously pillaged the city to resupply and gather horses for his "Green Dragoons". His men, mostly Tories from the North, wore green jackets to set them apart from British regulars. This fact was not lost on the Patriots and Southern Tories, who had to live with the retribution Tarleton's dragoons brought. Tarleton had built a reputation on the relentlessly paced movement of his men and his ruthlessness when they overtook their prey. Tarleton quickly took these supplies and men to Waxhaws Creek, near the border of the two Carolinas. There he made contact with Patriot Colonel Alexander Buford and his Virginia regiment. On horseback, Tarleton's men overtook the regiment. As the Virginians raised their hands in surrender, instead of offering them quarter, Tarleton's men cut down the regiment in a barbarous massacre.¹⁰¹

Tarleton's tactics were effective on the battlefield, but his methods turned into a rallying cry for the Patriot cause. It can be argued that Tarleton took rogue action at Waxhaws, but Cornwallis's lack of condemnation to this and other routine Patriot executions set the tone for the

⁹⁹ Ian R. Christie, *Crisis of Empire: Great Britain and the American colonies, 1754-1783* (New York, NY: Norton, 1966), 106.

¹⁰⁰ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 104.

¹⁰¹ Ibid, 87.

times. In fact, subsequent to the fall of 1780, Cornwallis ordered his officers to “take the most vigorous measures to extinguish the rebellion”.¹⁰² His men had little doubt as to what the order meant as their reign of terror raged on. Tories fighting under the British flag got their hands mercilessly bloody as well. William Cunningham, known as “Bloody Bill”, led a raid of several hundred horsemen into the backcountry. On 17 November 1781 at Cloud’s Creek, his men took a group of thirty Whigs by surprise. After the thirty had capitulated to the stronger force, twenty-eight were hacked to death, leaving only two remaining to tell the tale.¹⁰³

Collateral damage following the arrival of British troops was too high for many in the South. After the rebel resistance was squashed, British troops entered cities as conquerors, not as fellow countrymen focused on restoring security for loyal subjects of the Crown.¹⁰⁴ A Quaker merchant, Robert Morgan, recounted how British troops with “ignorant glee” burned down Loyalist houses and all their contents because patriot snipers were using them.¹⁰⁵ They would burn or destroy private and public buildings that were necessary to the survival of a town. Cornwallis’s officers, believing the Presbyterian Church was equivalent to “sedition shops”, burnt down as many churches as possible to punish as many rebels as possible.¹⁰⁶ Their actions strengthened the resolve of patriots, turned fence-sitters, and were detrimental to the Loyalist. Britain’s forces continued to have tactical successes but strategic losses as they quickly became mired in the brutality of the irregular warfare against the patriots.

The Patriots under the command of General Nathanael Greene found opposite fortunes from the British. Greene took command of the Patriot’s southern force on 2 December 1780

¹⁰² John Morgan Dederer, *Making Bricks Without Straw: Nathanael Greene's Southern Campaign and Mao Tse-Tung's Mobile War* (Manhattan, KS: Sunflower University Press, 1983), 32.

¹⁰³ Robert M. Weir, “The Violent Spirit, the Reestablishment of Order, and the Continuity of Leadership in Post-Revolutionary South Carolina.” In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, 70-98 (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 72.

¹⁰⁴ Oscar and Lilian Handlin, *A Restless People: Americans in Rebellion 1770-1787* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1982), 137.

¹⁰⁵ Russell F. Weigley, *The Partisan War: The South Carolina Campaign of 1780-1782* (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 61.

¹⁰⁶ John W. Gordon, *South Carolina and the American Revolution* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 103.

following a personal appointment by Washington. Before Greene's appointment, the Patriots would win very few battles. Greene inherited command of a region torn by civil war and an army decimated by superior Redcoat fighters. Initially after Greene's appointment, tactically, the Patriots won still very few battles; in fact, no victories came under his personal command. On most occasions, a tactical draw was the best for which Greene's men could hope; strategically, however, what Greene and his guerilla fighters accomplished was miraculous.

Greene had an innovative ability to coordinate undisciplined guerilla units with his remaining small band of disheartened Continentals and militia.¹⁰⁷ He was able to continue the defense of the cause for freedom by slowly driving a wedge between the British and their potential recruit base of undecided Americans and Loyalists. The struggle was not easy as Greene inherited his share of brutally violent combatants. Following the battle at Fort Motte in May 1781, Lieutenant Colonel "Light Horse Harry" Lee endorsed the execution of captured prisoners. Francis Marion, however, ended the executions when he intervened. Marion, with a reputation for violence himself, had a hard time controlling his men from whipping the remaining prisoners "almost to death".¹⁰⁸

For his part, Greene deliberately sought to stop the wanton violence. He believed the destructive force of revenge in his men's actions undermined his war efforts. He took his design on the conduct of war to the point of threatening the imposition of the death penalty for his men caught marauding.¹⁰⁹ Greene's design worked well with his hit and run guerilla tactics, for the population was soon working in support of his men to the detriment of the raiding Redcoats. When Greene ran in retreat, the people of South Carolina selflessly supported his armies with what little supplies they had and hid his men from the enemy Redcoats. It allowed Greene to

¹⁰⁷ John Morgan Dederer, *Making Bricks Without Straw: Nathanael Greene's Southern Campaign and Mao Tse-Tung's Mobile War* (Manhattan, KS: Sunflower University Press, 1983), 35.

¹⁰⁸ Robert M. Weir, "The Violent Spirit, the Reestablishment of Order, and the Continuity of Leadership in Post-Revolutionary South Carolina." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, 70-98 (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 72.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 75.

wage the successful war of attrition he called the “fugitive war” and is best summed as, “fight, get beat, rise and fight again”.¹¹⁰

In 1781, militia volunteers began to flock to Greene’s camps while Cornwallis was having little luck finding loyalists to strengthen his numbers. Greene, whose army now outnumbered Cornwallis two to one, had the upper hand and started to maneuver in search of a decisive battle. Cornwallis gave him his wish at Guilford Courthouse on 15 March 1781. Cornwallis, in spite of his waning numbers, maintained his confidence that his men were disciplined professionals while Greene had very few “regulars”. At Guilford Courthouse, Greene’s men fought valiantly and imposed a heavy toll on Cornwallis’ army. When they moved in to lock Cornwallis’ men into hand-to-hand fighting, Cornwallis turned his artillery on the battlefield, full of his own men and Patriots alike, forcing Greene to retreat. For the British, the battle simultaneously ended as a tactical victory, but a strategic loss due to the cost in personnel and material losses the American forces had inflicted upon them. Greene had turned the tide.

For Cornwallis, cut off from the sea and the ability to rebuild his army, a pursuit of Greene into the interior of South Carolina now seemed suicidal.¹¹¹ At the outset of the Southern Campaign, South Carolina appeared fertile ground for loyalist support. Now, in its interior, Cornwallis was isolated from his supply lines and appeared constantly surrounded as rebel fighters seemed to steadily flow from the woods. Cornwallis, therefore, shifted his strategic interests from South Carolina to Virginia. In Virginia, due to the vast system of inter-coastal waterways, Cornwallis believed he could maintain closer ties to the Royal Navy, regroup, and continue the Southern Campaign.

The strategy of working in close quarter to the Royal Navy had done well for the British at the onset of the war. In the initial campaign around New York, the British used the

¹¹⁰ Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution 1763-1789* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1982), 495.

¹¹¹ Russell F. Weigley, *The Partisan War: The South Carolina Campaign of 1780-1782*. (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 47.

surrounding rivers to conceal their movement and mask their intentions from the Americans. This strategy cost Washington dearly before he was able to turn the tide in New Jersey.¹¹² With this in mind, Cornwallis began a march for the tidal estuaries of the Chesapeake Bay. He left the remaining 8000 British troops in garrison spread thinly across the Carolinas. Before they could consolidate into a formidable field army, however, Greene's partisan fighters were upon them.¹¹³ Greene successfully kept the remaining British isolated and separated, attacking individual garrisons after he could amass a sufficient offensive. One by one, they fell. On 19 October 1781, Britain's southern campaign effectively ended with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, Virginia. A series of British missteps forced the superior British Army to retire their swords and hand victory to the fledgling Continentals and their bands of partisan guerillas.

Analysis of the Rebuilding of South Carolina

The British surrender at Yorktown all but ended the hostilities between England and America. Greene continued to battle isolated British garrisons in the South, but the negotiation process for peace between the two sides was ongoing. With the major combat operations finished, attention turned to the rebuilding of South Carolina. The signing of the Treaty of Paris 3 September 1783 removed any claim Britain maintained on the thirteen colonies and began a new era in American history. Finally, free of British tyranny, the Americans began the rebuilding process as they saw fit. In this section, the path they choose is outlined for study. Though this was a new chapter for the Americans, the groundwork for the rebuilding and unifying of the colonies had already begun before hostilities between the two sides had ended. How the historical background and the civil and military methods employed during the war shaped stability operations is analyzed. For contemporary armies, the key catalysts of the successful rebuilding following the American Revolution are gleaned for further use.

¹¹² David Hackett Fischer, *Washington's Crossing* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004), 365.

¹¹³ Russell F. Weigley, *The Partisan War: The South Carolina Campaign of 1780-1782* (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 47.

Previously, in 1781, the colonies had ratified the Articles of Confederation placing them all under a common governing document. Another important factor, which cannot be overlooked in the reunification of the Patriot and Tory factions, is the fact that many of the staunchest Loyalists fled the country when the British effort failed. It is intuitive that the capitulation of a large group representing the extreme end of the argument aided the reunification of the two sides. An estimated 70,000 Loyalist left everything in America for the promise of free land and a new start in other British colonies.¹¹⁴

This is not cause to overlook what the colonists accomplished in South Carolina. The total estimated number of Loyalist emigrants who left is only equal to approximately three percent of the total population.¹¹⁵ The rebuilding process was difficult but the colonists methodically worked through the problem. Obviously, the first task was to restore security by defeating the opposition. In this regard, they were no different from the English, but Patriot military leadership always kept an eye on the nurturing of civil morale. The establishment of an American-led civil government and the reestablishment of law and order were of the highest priority for American civil leadership. Lastly, the commercial opportunities that came in the rebuilding following hostilities aided in the stability. With the rebuilding framework in place, over the next years, the remaining Americans who sympathized with the Crown were able to re-assimilate into the fabric of society created by the victorious Patriots.

The hostilities of the war destroyed much of what the Americans had built in the colony. In 1782, American General William Moultrie on his way to Greene's camp recalled, the trip was the "most dull, melancholy, dreary ride that anyone could possible take." Another Scottish minister remarked, "all was desolation...Every field, every plantation, showed marks of ruin and

¹¹⁴ The largest groups of Loyalists emigrated to Canada and the Caribbean, but many returned to England as well. From the internet article "Loyalist (American Revolution)," *spiritus-temporis.com* (2005), [http://www.spiritus-temporis.com/loyalist-\(american-revolution\)](http://www.spiritus-temporis.com/loyalist-(american-revolution)) (accessed January 23, 2009)

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

devastation. Not a person was to be met with in the roads. All was gloomy.”¹¹⁶ From this deep destruction, the effort to rebuild took place. South Carolinians, war torn and finished with destruction, were ready to start the next chapter. Men frowned upon attacks against all but the most barbaric former Tories, and were ready for the tranquility that came with the absence of violent reprisal.¹¹⁷ The removal of the Tories by the British Royal Navy, the fatigue on the populations craving for fighting, and the sense of opportunity that came following the “leveling” of the colony all helped to encourage the rebuilding process.¹¹⁸

For the Patriots, the importance placed on the rebuilding process started before the fighting finished. Showing great insight, both Generals Greene and Washington understood the importance of civil morale on shaping the outcome of the war. It was not an easy task for either man to take on the superior British forces all while maintaining an eye on the end of the conflict.

Author Don Higginbotham captures the essence of the difficult assignment

To take a heterogeneous throng, somehow wire it together, and make it fight and at least occasionally win, all without antagonizing civilians and public officials, these were the challenges to generalship in Revolutionary America.¹¹⁹

General Washington was a master at this. He spent countless hours maintaining civil morale, while coping with the personnel issues of his men, and securing equipment for his army.¹²⁰

When Congress was unable to provide for the army, Washington ensured that the men sent out to forage for supplies from the population did so with benevolent intent.¹²¹

¹¹⁶ Two previous quotations from, Robert M. Weir, "The Violent Spirit, the Reestablishment of Order, and the Continuity of Leadership in Post-Revolutionary South Carolina." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, 70-98 (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 76-77.

¹¹⁷ Allan Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924), 404.

¹¹⁸ Oscar and Lilian Handlin, *A Restless People: Americans in Rebellion 1770-1787* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1982), 232.

¹¹⁹ Don Higginbotham, *War and Society in Revolutionary America: The Wider Dimensions of the Conflict* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 102.

¹²⁰ John Freling, *Almost a Miracle: The American Victory in the War of Independence* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007), 570.

¹²¹ David Hackett Fischer, *Washington's Crossing* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004), 276.

Whether Washington, while he commanded General Greene, purposefully passed on these traits is not known, but when Greene took command of the Continental Southern Army he recognized the need to restore order and followed the same mold. Nathanael Greene said of reprisal on the Tories, “[W]e have great reason to hate them, and vengeance would dictate universal slaughter”, but to do so would be a “fatal practice.” Instead, he wanted to “detach the disaffected from the British interest...” which “...can be done by gentle means only.”¹²² He knew if he could stop the affliction of war atrocities by his men, he could win the sentiment of the populous. In doing so, he hoped to strengthen his base of support, cut off the Redcoats’ ability to find support, and potentially win the war with the aid of the American people.

The American legislators also played an important role in the rebuilding. South Carolina Governor John Rutledge called for the legislature to meet in December 1781, while British troops still occupied Charleston. This was the first meeting since the fall of Charleston to the British almost two years earlier. The meeting took place in Jacksonborough, a small town thirty-five miles from Charleston. The most influential politicians, military leaders, and distinguished South Carolina men attended the meeting.¹²³ Though the representation from the lowcountry remained dominant, the backcountry’s men of influence attended and represented them well.¹²⁴ Two additional things set the Jacksonborough Legislature apart.

First, it showed the willingness of South Carolina leaders to begin the recovery process for the state even in such close proximity to the remaining British fighters. Second, and more important, the men passed a series of acts, known as the Confiscation Acts, which banished the area’s most aggressive Tories, or confiscated and heavily taxed their properties. On the surface,

¹²² John Freling, *Almost a Miracle: The American Victory in the War of Independence* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007), 518.

¹²³ Three signers of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Heyward, Edward Rutledge, and Arthur Middleton, were there. Influential military figures, Generals Sumter, Marion, Pickens, Henderson, Huger, Moultrie, and Colonels Laurens and Pinckney, attended. In addition, Christopher Gadsden, Hugh Rutledge, and Dr. David Ramsay attended.

¹²⁴ Allan Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924), 389.

this may seem a contrarian move, which further inhibits the establishment of long-term peace; instead, this is where the South Carolina healing process for the war began. Even following the brutality of the local fighting, the treatment of the Tories by lawmakers in South Carolina had been a great deal tamer than surrounding states.¹²⁵

The law divided perpetrators, by name, into two bodies. The first body included British subjects, all men who served with the English and had not surrendered themselves by order of the governor in 1779, those who avowed an entrenched allegiance to the King, those who held British commissions, and those who conspired with and congratulated the English when they took Charleston. The property of these men was confiscated and turned over to the state. The second body, men who accepted British protection and failed to surrender to the Patriots or who had furnished the British with supplies or money, was penalized by a heavy tax on the value of their property.¹²⁶

Not all those assembled at Jacksonborough applauded the creation of the Confiscation Acts. For those in opposition to the law, instead of working at reconciling the past, this law continued to segregate individuals into the war categories of Tory or Patriot. For these men, the confiscation laws had a vengeful tone that was not to be espoused by statesmen. For many others, the idea of Tory atrocities going unpunished was unthinkable. Though flawed, however, the confiscation laws were the first steps toward rebuilding the state under the rule of law.

First, the law took power away from Patriot mobs and marauders, bent on revenge of Tory actions, and placed the burden on the government. For Governor Rutledge, this important first step was to be executed “with lenity”.¹²⁷ Prior to his call for the confiscation laws, the governor had offered pardon to Loyalists who surrendered their allegiance to the Crown and pledged to serve a six-month term in the state’s militia. Next, he reopened the court system as

¹²⁵ Ibid., 390-391.

¹²⁶ Details of confiscation laws in Allan Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924), 391.

¹²⁷ Allan Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924), 393.

quickly as possible to further legitimize the re-establishment of the state's government. Private retribution and crimes against Tories were not tolerated. The lessons from the Regulator movement twenty years earlier were still fresh in their minds.

South Carolina's established leaders knew the populace would quickly render their tenure irrelevant and take the reins of law and order into their own hands if the public felt wrongdoers were going unpunished.¹²⁸ In early 1783, only months after the removal of the remaining British in Charleston, the legislature passed a modification to the Confiscation Act that took away the estates of Loyalists who left with the British. At the same time that this modification added approximately seven hundred names to the list of estates to be confiscated, the legislature began hearing appeals from the men identified by the initial acts and, in many cases, released their estates back to them or greatly reduced their burden to the state.¹²⁹ Why was this gesture of reconciliation offered while South Carolina was burdened with a steep war debt that could have been lessened by the sale of the estates? General Moultrie states the motivation best

When they had got possession of the country again, and peace was restored, they were softened with pity, and had compassion for their fellow sufferers, and listened with cheerfulness to the prayer of their petitions. I had the honor of being appointed chairman of a large committee from the Senate, to meet a very large committee from the House of representatives, to hear . . . the several petitions; and after sitting several weeks, and giving everyone a fair and impartial hearing, a report was made to the separate houses in favor of a great majority; and a great part of those names which were upon the confiscation, banishment, and amercement lists were struck off; and after a few years, on their presenting their petitions year by year, almost the whole of them had their estates restored to them, and themselves, restored as fellow citizens.¹³⁰

All heard the pleas for reconciliation from men like Christopher Gadsden. For a man imprisoned by the British, he argued for remarkably fair treatment of the Loyalists. Gadsden urged legislators to "pursue every prudent, reasonable, humble and truly political step, devoid of

¹²⁸ Robert M. Weir, "The Violent Spirit, the Reestablishment of Order, and the Continuity of Leadership in Post-Revolutionary South Carolina." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, 70-98 (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 87.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 79.

¹³⁰ Allan Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924), 393.

passions and vindictive resolution”.¹³¹ In South Carolina, legislators therefore sought to strike a fine balance between compassion for Loyalists and imposition of restitution for loyalty to the enemy of the state during the war. Working through the establishment of the rule of law was essential to the rebuilding process. It is true, Loyalists did not completely escape the wrath of public bitterness, but the timing and harshness of the confiscation laws worked to preempt mob violence against them.

For those Tories who remained in South Carolina, many with broken homes and pillaged farms, the opportunities to rebuild were more attractive than leaving with the British to start over anew. In fact, from the destruction, pillaging of slaves, war shortages, and post conflict rebuilding effort, new opportunities emerged for new sets of industrious people.¹³² The war seemed to level the playing field for many to take advantage of the opportunity, and “there was no discounting the effect of opportunity”¹³³ on the rebuilding process. The loss of the slave labor force at the hands of the English initially decimated rice plantation owners in the lowcountry. The rice crop was still profitable with new trading partners in France and Spain and as the owners acquired new labor forces, they rebuilt the plantations. Though the war decimated the backcountry, resilient small farmers picked up where they left off. The initial struggles of the large plantation owners aided the rehabilitation of the small farms by making their available crops more profitable. Indigo farmers were not as fortunate. With the loss of English demand for indigo, many turned to cotton to offset the loss. The profit margin for the labor intensive cotton crop was small and made for rough going. That all would change with the patent of the cotton

¹³¹ Robert M. Weir, "The Violent Spirit, the Reestablishment of Order, and the Continuity of Leadership in Post-Revolutionary South Carolina." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, 70-98 (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985), 84.

¹³² Oscar and Lilian Handlin, *A Restless People: Americans in Rebellion 1770-1787* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1982), 234.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 234.

gin within five years of the signing of the Constitution. Cotton would soon be king and bring great wealth back to South Carolina.¹³⁴

What South Carolina accomplished after the severe brutality of the war was astonishing, but the underlying message of the rebuilding was simple. South Carolina's leaders aspired to no greater cause than the reestablishment of the land of opportunity via law and order, which they had striven to build before the hostilities with Britain. The Department of the Army's field manual, *Stability Operations*, FM 3-07, revised October 2008, captures this simple message well. Chapter two in the field manual lays out the "Primary Stability Tasks", which chapter three further expands, of: 1) Establish Civil Security; 2) Establish Civil Control; 3) Restore Essential Services; 4) Support the Governance; and 5) Support to Economic and Infrastructure Development. This mirrors the strategy South Carolinian leaders used for unification after the American Revolutionary war. Refreshingly, the revised *Stability Operations* field manual takes a different stance from its predecessor. Upfront it acknowledges how the American experience shaped the American Strategy concerning stability, and places an emphasis on the American Revolution.¹³⁵ The primary stability tasks read as if they were plagiarized from the notes of Patriot leaders in South Carolina some 200 years old.¹³⁶

In contrast, FM 3-07 before its revision was outdated and lacked historical perspective. The February 2003 version of FM 3-07 reads like a maneuver manual intent on the domination of an enemy rather than a guide for the promotion of stability following combat operations. Its tone is set from the overview with statements like, "The Army commands the respect of belligerents by the threat of force, or, if that fails, the use of force to compel compliance"¹³⁷, and from calls

¹³⁴ Agricultural opportunities discussed in Louis B. Wright, *South Carolina: A Bicentennial History*, (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1976), 149-153.

¹³⁵ U.S. Department of the Army, *Stability Operations* (Washington, DC: Headquarters of the Department of the Army, 2008), 1-1.

¹³⁶ Primary tasks identified in chapter 2 and expanded on in chapter 3 of U.S. Department of the Army, *Stability Operations* (Washington, DC: Headquarters of the Department of the Army, 2008)

¹³⁷ U.S. Department of the Army, *Stability operations and Support Operations* (Washington, DC: Headquarters Department of the Army, 2003), 1-1 and 1-2.

for “engagement and response” in its description of stability operations. The superseded version states, “Offensive and defensive operations normally dominate military operations in war, as well as some smaller scale contingencies.”¹³⁸ Further, subchapters early in the manual like: battlefield organization, maneuver, intelligence, fire support, air defense, etc. are better served elsewhere. The manual misses the mark regarding the importance of stability operations following war. Rightly, the margin of victory in war has evolved from the measure of body counts or seeking the unconditional surrender of the enemy. Victory in today’s protracted conflicts is measured by the creation of extended peace through popular unity in belligerent states or regions via stability operations.¹³⁹ In this regard, the American Revolution was unique for its time and remains a model for learning in modern military affairs.¹⁴⁰ As highlighted, the Americans worked on the reestablishment of the rule of law, paid mind to the fostering of civil governance, and longed for the return of their economic prosperity before security was even assured.

Conclusions

By examining the unique experience of the American Revolution, this monograph collected the driving factors that allowed the separate factions, Patriot and Loyalist, to unite following conflict. The study focused on South Carolina, home of the most brutal partisan fighting of the war, in search of a framework for popular unity in the aftermath of irregular conflict. The tale is really one of two opposing ideologies and which one would end victorious. For The British, the self-serving nature of the Parliament and the brutal way the British Army waged war eroded their credibility with Americans and was counterproductive to their interests.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 1-1.

¹³⁹ U.S. Department of the Army, *Stability Operations* (Washington, DC: Headquarters of the Department of the Army, 2008), vi.

¹⁴⁰ As an example, though the beginnings of the American and French Revolutions are only separated by thirteen years, and both draw their philosophical ideals from similar origins in the age of enlightenment, the two revolutions are profoundly different. Fredrich von Gentz summaries the differences into four categories, to include lawlessness of the origin, character of the conduct, quality of the object, and the compass of resistance. Gentz’s argument structured around the four categories works to show the defensive nature of the American Revolution in sharp contrast to the offensive struggle of the French to maintain their revolution for the revolutions sake. Fredrich von Gentz, “The French and American Revolutions Compared,” in *Three Revolutions*, 3-95 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1976).

The British leadership arrogantly passed on their exceedingly high war debt incurred during the Seven Year's War to the American colonists by the way of arbitrary taxation. Colonists revolted as they rightfully believed the taxation would undermine their economic prosperity. As the Revolutionary War continued, the prospect of the American economic future under greater British control seemed bleak and whittled away at the support for the Crown.

When hostilities erupted between the British and Americans, the British military took a laissez faire attitude towards protecting its Loyalist supporters, leaving them at the mercy of reprisals from its enemies. The matter of security from Indian attack and, especially in South Carolina, the plundering of backcountry outlaws had always been an issue for the colonists. Britain's perceived alliance with the regions Indians and outlaws undermined their civil authority throughout the area.

Throughout the war, British war atrocities ran counterproductive to their ends. What they did not realize is that extreme violence and terror does not necessarily crush rebellion. For the Americans, it strengthened the Patriot will to resist and turned those in the middle-ground against the crown. The wanton acts of violence committed for the Crown by Redcoats, Hessian mercenaries, and other Loyalists made even the remaining Americans wonder about their future under post-war British rule.

Contrarily, one of the first orders of business for the Patriot leaders, even when their own security from the British forces was in question, was the diligent effort to establish the rule of law. For South Carolina leaders, the Regulator movement, years earlier, drove this lesson home. They knew the way forward rested on the civil reestablishment of governmental authority. When the staunchest Loyalists fled the country post-conflict they surely aided the success of the Patriot cause, but for all who remained, the groundwork for a clear pathway for future healing had been previously laid.

The ultimate goal of the Patriots was the reestablishment of what they built before the war; another important factor in their success was that they did not out reach their grasp. The

issue of slavery in the colonies is an example of this. Slavery was contrary to the enlightened philosophy that drove the revolution. This fact weighed heavily on many during their effort to rebuild.¹⁴¹ These wise leaders reluctantly made the decision to allow the new nation to heal from its war wounds by compromising on the issue of slavery and not condemning it at that time. Ultimately, the enlightened ideology of free men following the Revolution would grip the country in civil war over the institution of slavery.¹⁴² How the circumstances would have changed if a compromise could not have been reached is left for further study.

In the end, the monograph serves as a validation of the strides the United States Military has made in response to the increasing challenge irregular warfighting and stability operations holds on the future. As stated in the introduction, the US Army field manual on counterinsurgency, revised December 2006, lacks anecdotal evidence that the Revolutionary American experience influenced the doctrine. It reads slightly nearsighted, like a “how to manual” for the War in Iraq. With the difficulties from the Iraq War looming large in the Army’s consciousness at the time of the manual’s publication, it is probably folly to hope for more. More importantly, however, its content marries well with the content in the Stability Operations manual, which is heavily influenced by the experience of the American Revolution. As the military continues to improve its understanding of future conflicts and conflict resolution, it is encouraging to see the doctrine shaped by the timeless lessons of the unique American experience. Based on the study of South Carolina in the American Revolution and its rebuilding afterward, the US military is making great strides in the right direction. The framework for the rebuilding operations in Iraq and the marriage of counterinsurgency and stability operations that

¹⁴¹ The issues of slavery and taxation of the slave trade were used as heated leverage points between Northern and Southern leaders at the Constitutional Convention of May 1787. Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution 1763-1789* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1982), 643-646.

¹⁴² Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 187.

the revised military doctrine will take to Afghanistan are based on sound principles from the American past.

Future American involvement in world conflict or revolution will become an increasingly difficult affair. The recent revisions of the Army doctrine cited in this paper revealed that the US military is open to the study of the past to help shape the future. The way ahead for the American military should continue to follow four categories, which demonstrated the uniqueness of the American Revolution.¹⁴³ The four categories include the lawfulness of the origin, character of the conduct, quality of the object, and the compass of resistance. That is, before sides are drawn in future conflict, as the world's hyper-power, the United States has to guard against the perception it is engaging in internationally unlawful acts as potential unilateral decisions in the support of national interests are made. Again, as the world's hyper-power, from the onset of conflict the quality of the U.S. objectives must be clear and open so they do not come into question. Further, the U.S. character of conduct must not waiver from well-advertised U.S. values, or the effort will be undermined. Together these points, taken from the past, can strengthen the compass of the resolve of the U.S. and its international allies against any future resistance.

¹⁴³ Four categories from Freidrich von Gentz, "The French and American Revolutions Compared," In *Three Revolutions*, 3-95 (Wesport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1976), 95.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "A Brief History of South Carolina." *The Official Website of the State of South Carolina*. 2009. <http://www.state.sc.us/scdah/history.htm> (accessed January 2, 2009).
- Army, U.S. Department of the. *Counterinsurgency*. Washington, DC: Headquarters Department of the Army, 2006.
- . *Stability Operations*. Washington, DC: Headquarters of the Department of the Army, 2008.
- . *Stability operations and Support Operations*. Washington, DC: Headquarters Department of the Army, 2003.
- Bass, Robert D. *Swamp Fox: The Life and Campaigns of General Francis Marion*. Columbia, SC: Sandlapper Press, Inc., 1972.
- Brown, Richard D. *Major Problems in the Era of the American Revolution 1760-1791*. Lexington, MA: DC Heath and Company, 1992.
- Christie, Ian R. *Crisis of Empire: Great Britain and the American colonies, 1754-1783*. New York, NY: Norton, 1966.
- Dederer, John Morgan. *Making Bricks Without Straw: Nathanael Greene's Southern Campaign and Mao Tse-Tung's Mobile War*. Manhattan, KS: Sunflower University Press, 1983.
- Diamond, Larry. "Promoting Democracy in Post-Conflict and Failed States." *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*, Volume 2, No. 2, 2005: 96.
- Edgar, Walter B. *Partisans and Redcoats*. New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2001.
- Fischer, David Hackett. *Washington's Crossing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Freling, John. *Almost a Miracle: The American Victory in the War of Independence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Gentz, Friedrich. "The French and American Revolutions Compared." In *Three Revolutions*, 3-95. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1976.
- Gordon, John W. *South Carolina and the American Revolution*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003.
- Handlin, Oscar and Lilian. *A Restless People: Americans in Rebellion 1770-1787*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1982.
- Higginbotham, Don. *War and Society in Revolutionary America: The Wider Dimensions of the Conflict*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988.
- Johnson, Maj Todd J. *Nathanael Greene's Implementation of Compound Warfare During the Southern Campaign of the American Revolution*. Masters Monograph, Fort Leavenworth, KS: School of Advanced Military Studies United States Army Command and General Staff College, 2007.

- Klein, Rachel N. "Frontier Planters and the American Revolution: The South Carolina Backcountry, 1775-1782." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, 37-69. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985.
- Kreis, Steven. "Thomas Paine, 1737-1809." *The History Guide: Lectures on Modern European Intellectual History*. 2000. <http://www.historyguide.org/intellect/paine.html> (accessed February 14, 2009).
- "Loyalist (American Revolution)." *spiritus-temporis.com*. 2005. [http://www.spiritus-temporis.com/loyalist-\(american-revolution\)](http://www.spiritus-temporis.com/loyalist-(american-revolution)) (accessed January 23, 2009).
- MacKinnon, Barbara. *American Philosophy*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press, 1985.
- McLaughlin, Andrew C. *The Confederation and the Constitution 1783-1789*. New York, NY: The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1962.
- Middlekauff, Robert. *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution 1763-1789*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Nevins, Allan. *The American States During and After the Revolution 1775-1789*. New York, NY: The Macmillan, 1924.
- Pancake, John S. *This Destructive War: The British Campaign in Carolina 1780-1783*. Tuscaloosa, AL : University of Alabama Press, 1985.
- "South Carolina." *South Carolina Military Museum*. <http://www.scguard.com/museum/South%20Carolina.htm> (accessed January 2, 2009).
- Stephenson, Michael. *Patriot Battles*. New York, NY: HarperCollins, 2007.
- "The British Surrender at Yorktown, 1781 ." *EyeWitness to History*. 2002. <http://www.eyewitnesstohistory.com> (accessed January 1, 2009).
- U.S. Census Bureau. "Estimated Population of American Colonies, 1630-1780." In *The World Almanac and Book of Facts 2008*, 592. New York, NY: World Almanac Education Group, 2008.
- U.S. State Department. "Parliamentary taxation of colonies, international trade, and American Revolution, 1763-1775." *USA.gov*. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/cp/90617.htm> (accessed January 18, 2009).
- Weigley, Russell F. *The Partisan War: The South Carolina Campaign of 1780-1782*. Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 1970.
- Weir, Robert M. "The Violent Spirit, the Reestablishment of Order, and the Continuity of Leadership in Post-Revolutionary South Carolina." In *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry During the American Revolution*, by Ronald Hoffman, Thad W. Tate and Peter J. Albert, 70-98. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1985.

Wood, Gordon S. *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

Wright, Louis B. *South Carolina: A Bicentennial History*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1976.